

Amendment, which amended original claims 3-9, not claims 3-9 of PCT amended page 10 attached to the LETTER of July 28, 1998.

Thus, prior to the instant amendment, claims 1-15 were pending in the instant application. In light of the instant amendment, claims 1-7 and 13-35 are presented for examination. If the Examiner so desires, counsel will submit a further amendment canceling all pending claims and replacing them with new claims corresponding to claims 1-7 and 13-35, if this will procedurally facilitate examination.

Rejections to Claim Language

Claims 1, 3, 6 and 9 were objected to because of asserted language informalities. These language informalities, however, are either not present in original claims 1, 3, 6 and 9 or have been eliminated by the above amendments. Therefore, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner's suggestions with respect to claim language are both noted and appreciated.

Objection Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 on grounds that claims recite a "use" without reciting process steps. This rejection, however, refers to claims 1-9 in the PCT amended page 10, attached to the LETTER of July 28, 1998. The only "use" claims in the original claims were claims 13 and 14. These claims are amended above so as to no longer be in the "use" format.

In view of the above remarks, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101 is respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd ¶

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd ¶, as being indefinite. Here again, the rejection does not refer to pending claims 1-9, but instead refers to claims 1-9 presented in the PCT amended page 10 attached to the LETTER of July 28, 1998.

In any event, the pending claims do not recite the language objected to in §112 rejection. For example, claims 3 and 6 as amended above recite proper Markush language in accordance

with MPEP §2173.05(h). Also, the claims do not recite such language as “especially,” “type” or “common forms.”


With respect to the Examiner’s inquiry of “non-peptidergic”, see the attached excerpt from Dorland’s Illustrated Medical Dictionary, 26th Edition (1981).

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner’s indication that claims reciting methods of treating gynecological disorders selected from endometrioses and myomas would be allowable. In this regard, see, e.g., applicants’ claims 13, 19 and 20.

In view of the above remarks, withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101 and §112, 2nd paragraph, and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,


Brion P. Heaney (Reg. No. 32,542)
Attorney for Applicants

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO & BRANIGAN, P.C.
Arlington Courthouse Plaza I
2200 Clarendon Boulevard, Suite 1400
Arlington, Virginia 22201
Direct Dial: (703) 812-5308
Facsimile: (703) 243-6410
Internet Address: heaney@mwzb.com

Filed: October 27, 1999

BPH:imm\K:\PAT\Sch\1655\Amendment.wpd